

## **REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are requested in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-31 are pending in the present application with claims 1, 2, 25 and 26 being independent.

### **I. Title of the Invention**

The Office Action states that the title of the invention is not descriptive, and requires a new title that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

As requested by the Examiner, the current title of the invention "ENTERLINK CONDUCTOR" has been changed to "ENTERLINK CONDUCTOR FOR PROVIDING A FEDERATED BUSINESS TO BUSINESS SYSTEM THAT INTERCONNECTS APPLICATIONS OF MULTIPLE COMPANIES" to be more clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

### **II. Double Patenting Rejection**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-25 of U.S. Patent 6,647,420. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Independent claims 1, 2, 25 and 26 of the present application, and the claims depending therefrom, include the limitations of a conductor comprising:

- a second process engine that executes compound processes;
- a compound process repository that stores compound processes;
- a process engine user interface to monitor and manage the second process engine;
- a conductor engine that controls the operation of the second process engine;

a conductor repository that stores participant objects and relationship objects; and  
a conductor user interface to monitor and manage the conductor engine.

None of these limitations are recited by, or included in, claims 1-25 of U.S. Patent 6,647,420. Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-31 of the present application do not claim the same invention as that of claims 1-25 of U.S. Patent 6,647,420.

For at least this reason, reconsideration and withdrawal of the double patenting rejection of claims 1-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is respectfully requested.

### **III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

#### **A. Obviousness in View of Sheard et al. and Butman et al.**

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 3-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheard et al. (U.S. Patent 6,208,345) in view of Butman et al. (U.S. Patent 5,870,562). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Sheard et al. discloses a visual data integration system architecture and methodology that includes a transport framework that represents a technology-independent integration mechanism which facilitates the exchange of technology-dependent data between disparate applications. A visual interface facilitates the design, deployment, and runtime monitoring of an integrated information system implementation. An integrated information system is developed visually through use of the visual interface by dragging and dropping component icons within a canvas area of the interface. Interconnections between components placed in the canvas area are graphically established to define sources and destinations of specified data. An underlying configuration and runtime information framework transforms the graphical interconnections into logical or physical interconnections (see column 3, lines 10-35).

A data exchange architecture is illustrated in FIG. 6 that provides the ability to modify routing logic, business logic, or the format of a given data stream/application without requiring

any modification to programs or configurations within a data exchange infrastructure 62. An application or format of a particular data stream may be modified by modifying the interface logic of an implicated adapter. Additional modifications may be made by making changes to the routing logic 66 and the business logic 68. Modifications to the routing logic, business logic, and adapter logic may be effected using the visual interface 61 (see column 12, lines 40-65). Sheard et al. also discloses that each time an adapter is deployed, a set of meta definition files is supplied that corresponds to the specific functionality of the adapter. The meta definitions define one or more input objects, one or more output objects, and may provide an internal definition of the operation that is performed when a specific input object is received (see column 31, lines 24-31).

However, Sheard et al. fails to disclose or suggest a conductor comprising a second process engine that executes compound processes; a compound process repository that stores compound processes; a process engine user interface to monitor and manage the second process engine; a conductor engine that controls the operation of the second process engine; a conductor repository that stores participant objects and relationship objects; and a conductor user interface to monitor and manage the conductor engine. These limitations are not disclosed at the locations indicated by the Office Action, or elsewhere in the Sheard et al. reference. Regarding the user interfaces, Sheard et al. discloses a visual interface 61, but does not disclose a process engine user interface in addition to a conductor user interface.

Butman et al. discloses a system for managing information communications between different client entities on different networks (see column 8, line 50 – column 9, line 32; abstract). However, Butman et al. fails to disclose or suggest a conductor comprising a second process engine that executes compound processes; a compound process repository that stores compound processes; a process engine user interface to monitor and manage the second process engine; a conductor engine that controls the operation of the second process engine; a conductor repository that stores participant objects and relationship objects; and a conductor user interface to monitor and manage the conductor engine.

Claims 1, 2, 25 and 26 recite a conductor comprising a second process engine that executes compound processes; a compound process repository that stores compound processes; a process engine user interface to monitor and manage the second process engine; a conductor engine that controls the operation of the second process engine; a conductor repository that stores participant objects and relationship objects; and a conductor user interface to monitor and manage the conductor engine. As discussed above, Sheard et al. fails to disclose one or more of these claim elements. Butman et al., alone or in combination with Sheard et al., does not cure this defect. For at least these reasons, claims 1, 2, 25 and 26 are allowable.

Claims 3-14 depend from claim 2. As discussed above, claim 2 is allowable subject matter. For this reason and the additional features recited therein, claims 3-14 are also allowable.

For at least the reasons above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 3-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are respectfully requested.

#### **B. Obviousness in View of Sheard et al.**

The Office Action rejects claims 2, 10 and 15-31 as being unpatentable over Sheard et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 10 and 15-24 depend from claim 2. Claims 27-31 depend from claim 26. As discussed above, claims 2, 25 and 26 are allowable subject matter. For this reason and the additional features recited therein, claims 10, 15-24 and 27-31 are also allowable.

For at least the reasons above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2, 10 and 15-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are respectfully requested.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance. Should the Examiner believe that this application is in condition for disposition other than allowance, the Examiner is

invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below in order to address the Examiner's concerns.

Please apply any necessary additional charges or credits to Deposit Account 50-1721.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

23 May 05

\_\_\_\_\_  
Stephen C. Glazier  
Reg. No. 31,361  
(202) 778-9045

Kirkpatrick & Lockhart Nicholson Graham LLP  
1800 Massachusetts Ave., NW  
2nd Floor  
Washington, DC 20036  
Tel: (202) 778-9000  
Fax: (202) 778-9100